



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/589,780 | 08/17/2006 | Bianchi Gianfranco | 53854.4.1 | 2422 |
| 22859 | 7590 | 12/16/2008 | EXAMINER | |
| INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP | | | MENON, KRISHNAN S | |
| FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A. | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 200 SOUTH SIXTH STREET | | | | 1797 |
| SUITE 4000 | | | | |
| MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | | |
| 12/16/2008 | PAPER | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/589,780 | GIANFRANCO, BIANCHI | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Krishnan S. Menon | 1797 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/17/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-24 are pending as preliminarily amended 8/17/06

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 8/17/08 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires the following: (1) a list of all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office; (2) U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications listed in a section separately from citations of other documents; (3) the application number of the application in which the information disclosure statement is being submitted on each page of the list; (4) a column that provides a blank space next to each document to be considered, for the examiner's initials; and (5) a heading that clearly indicates that the list is an information disclosure statement. The information disclosure statement has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

“or the like” in claim 7 is indefinite - it fails to show what is included in “or the like”.

Antecedent basis problems:

Said motor in claim 1 lacks antecedent basis.

Discharge duct R1 in claim 3

Discharge branch R1 in claim 4

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of EP 0205045A, EP 1 120 556 (US 6,414,399 to Bianchi), Lerat (US 4,169,789), Ravin (US 4,658,771), and/or Ullmann (US 4,264,826).

This reference teaches (cf. abstract, page 5, paragraphs 2 to page 6, paragraph 3; figure 1) an operating unit comprising a first pump (4) for supplying water coming from outside the operating unit, filtering means (21) for treating the water supplied from outside the unit, a second pump (16) for feeding the water to said filtering means (21) and a water flow path extending between said first and second pumps (4,16), wherein along said water flow path the water flow is split so as to maintain predefined pressure conditions at the intake of the second pump. No engine and generator are explicitly disclosed in D1 however their association with an operating unit according to D1 is well known in the art as seen in document D2 (cf. abstract, page 5, paragraphs 2 to page 6, paragraph 3; figure 1).

Dependent claims 2-24 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, makes these claims patentable because the subject-matter of claims 2,3 is known from EP'045, the subject-matter of **claims 4-**

7,12,15 is known from the combination of EP'045 and EP'556, the subject-matter of **claims 8-10** is known from the combination of EP'045, EP'556 and Lerat (cf. column 4, lines 43-58, column 8, line 56 to column 9, line 20; figure 2), the subject-matter of **claim 14** is known from the combination of EP'045, EP'556 and Ravin (cf. column 2, lines 21-27; figure 2), the subject-matter of **claims 17-18** is known from the combination of EP'045, EP'556 and Ullmann (cf. column 1, line 64 to column 2, line 22; figure 1) and the subject-matter of **claims 11, 13, 16, 19-24** are merely one of several straightforward possibilities from which the skilled person would select in ordinary course of engineering design, in accordance with circumstances, and are not patentable limitations unless applicant can show secondary evidence of patentability. See KSR Int'l. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1732, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1390 (2007). "it is commonsense that familiar items have obvious uses beyond their primary purposes, and a person of ordinary skill often will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle". "The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krishnan S. Menon whose telephone number is 571-272-1143. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R. Sample can be reached on 571-272-1376. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Krishnan S Menon/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797